

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

GREGORY J. TURLEY,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Case No. 08-cv-0007-SCW
vs.)	
)	Jury Trial Date:
DANNY BEDINGER, et al.,)	<u>February, 20, 2012 at 9:00 a.m.</u>
)	
Defendants.)	

AMENDED SCHEDULING ORDER

WILLIAMS, Magistrate Judge:

On Friday, June 10, 2011, an in-Court Motion Hearing was held on all three of Plaintiff Gregory Turley's ("Turley's") pending actions. The Court took up all of Turley's pending motions, including his Motion to Compel (Doc. 65), and Motion to Appear and Motion for Issuance of Subpoenas (Doc. 83), both filed in the above-captioned action. Further, in this action, the parties filed their consent for this matter to resolved in its entirety by a United States magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c)(1). Accordingly, the undersigned hereby enters the following Amended Scheduling Order and summarizes the rulings that it previously made on the record during the June 10, 2011 Hearing:

1. The dates set in the original Trial Practice and Schedule entered on April 27, 2011 (Doc. 73), are hereby **VACATED**.
2. The parties noted that initial disclosures pursuant to FEDERAL RULE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 26 and initial discovery requests have already been served.
3. All discovery, including discovery as to expert witnesses, SHALL be completed by **October 24, 2011**.
4. Any interrogatories, requests for production of documents, or requests for admissions SHALL be served so as to allow the answering party the full 30 day period in which to respond, as provided by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

5. Dispositive motions SHALL be filed no later than **November 7, 2011**.
6. A Final Pretrial Conference is hereby SET before the undersigned Magistrate Judge for **January 23, 2012 at 9:00 a.m.** in accordance with SDIL-LR 16.2(b).¹
7. This case is hereby SET for Jury Trial before the undersigned on **February 21, 2012, at 9:00 a.m.** in the Federal Courthouse, East St. Louis, Illinois.

Regarding the Motion to Compel filed by Turley on May 11, 2011: the Court noted on the record its serious concerns with Turley's allegations that access to his legal files and documents routinely is being impeded. However, according to Turley, since May 18, 2011, he has been given access to his legal files on four occasions. Further, in light of the newly amended Scheduling Order, some of Turley's time constraint concerns have been alleviated. Accordingly, this motion (Doc. 74) was **DENIED as moot**.

Similarly, within his Reply to Defendants' Response to his Motion to Compel (Doc. 82), Turley attempted to file a "Motion to Appear and for Subpoena's" (Doc. 83). Generally speaking, motions should always be filed as their own separate document. Nevertheless, because these motions relate to the Motion to Compel, it was also found to be and **DENIED as moot**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: June 15, 2011.

/s/ **Stephen C. Williams**

STEPHEN C. WILLIAMS

United States Magistrate Judge

¹ Upon further consideration, the Court has pushed back the Jury Trial date that it originally gave to the parties during the hearing in order to allow more time for consideration of potential dispositive motions.